

## **REMARKS**

This application has been reviewed in light of the FINAL REJECTION mailed January 12, 2007. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8 and 10 are pending in the application with Claims 2, 3, 5 and 10 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 2, 3, 5 and 10 are amended.

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to recite: "...said plurality of transmission channels for each said mobile station forming a communication link between each said mobile station and said base station ..." and Claims 5, 7 and 10 are similarly amended. The limitations recited in the claims are fully supported throughout the specification, and in particular in FIG. 3. Therefore, no new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

### **I. Rejection of Claims 2, 3, 5, 8 and 10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 2, 3, 5, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,914,950 issued to Tiedemann Jr. et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,914,950 issued to Tanaka et al.

Neither Tiedemann Jr. et al. nor Tanaka et al. disclose that the plurality of transmission channels form a communication link between each mobile station and a base station. In Tiedemann Jr. et al. each channel is disclosed as being a communication link between one mobile station and one of a plurality of base stations, thus the plurality of channels disclosed in Tiedemann Jr. et al. form a plurality communication links between one mobile station and a plurality of base stations. This is contrary to Applicant's invention, which provides a plurality of channels between each mobile station and one base station. Tanaka et al. fails to overcome the above-identified deficiency in Tiedemann Jr. et al. Thus, Tiedemann Jr. et al. and Tanaka et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose or suggest Applicant's plurality of

transmission channels forming a communication link between each mobile station and the base station.


Therefore, as currently presented, Claims 2, 3, 5, 8 and 10 are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 2, 3, 5, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tiedemann Jr. et al. in view of Tanaka et al.

## CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 2, 3, 5, 8 and 10 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.  
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:ae